

1 SUE ANN SALMON EVANS, State Bar No. 151562  
 2 sevans@mbdlaw.com  
 3 AMY R. LEVINE, State Bar No. 160743  
 4 alevine@mbdlaw.com  
 5 SARAH L. W. SUTHERLAND, State Bar No. 239889  
 6 ssutherland@mbdlaw.com  
 7 MILLER BROWN & DANNIS  
 8 750 B Street, Suite 2310  
 9 San Diego, CA 92101  
 10 Telephone: (619) 595-0202  
 11 Facsimile: (619) 702-6202

12 Attorneys for San Diego Unified School District

13  
 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 15 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16  
 17 Tyler Brenneise, Allison Brenneise and  
 18 Robert Brenneise,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 San Diego Unified School District,

22 Defendant.

23 Case No. 08 CV 0028 WQH WMc

24 **NOTICE OF RELATED CASES [Civ.L.R.  
 25 40.1(e)]**

26 Trial: **none set**

27 **I. NOTICE OF RELATED CASES**

28 Pursuant to the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court for the  
 1 Southern District of California Civil Rule 40.1, notice is hereby given that the above captioned  
 2 case entitled Tyler Brenneise et. al. v. San Diego Unified School District, United States District  
 3 Court – Southern District of California, Case No. 08 CV 0028 WQH WMc, filed on January 4,  
 4 2008, is related to the case entitled San Diego Unified School District v. T.B. et. al., United States  
 5 District Court – Southern District of California, Case No. 08 CV 0039 L RBB, also filed on  
 6 January 4, 2008.

7 The cases are related in that both cases involve the same parties and are based on the same  
 8 or similar claims and events. Civ.L.R. 40.1(f)(1) and (2). More specifically, both cases pertain to  
 9 the same student, same family, same school district, same school year, same counsel, and same

1 offers of a free, appropriate public education.

2 The cases are also related on the ground that both cases involve the same or substantially  
3 similar questions of law. Civ.L.R. 40.1(f)(3). Both parties seek review of the same underlying  
4 administrative proceeding, convened pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education  
5 Improvement Act (“IDEA”), 20 U.S.C. sections 1400 *et seq.*, and adjudication of rights under the  
6 IDEA. Both cases are currently pending in the same court, but are currently assigned to different  
7 judges. Assigning both cases to the same judge, and ultimately consolidating both cases, will  
8 prevent substantial duplication of efforts and will be in the best interest of all parties and the  
9 Court. Civ.L.R. 40.1

10  
11 DATED: February 14, 2008

MILLER BROWN & DANNIS

12  
13 By: /s/  
14 SARAH L. W. SUTHERLAND  
15 Attorneys for San Diego Unified School District

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
MILLER BROWN & DANNIS  
SYMPHONY TOWERS  
750 B STREET, SUITE 2310  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101